UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/815,143	03/31/2004	Angel Stoyanov	WEYE121925/25324	8224	
	7590 03/20/200 SER COMPANY	8	EXAMINER		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT., CH 1J27			CORDRAY, DENNIS R		
P.O. BOX 9777 FEDERAL WAY, WA 98063			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1791		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/20/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@weyerhaeuser.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Interview Summary	10/815,143	STOYANOV ET A Art Unit 1791 1791 At al (5637193). A. If an agreement veness and anticipe al with respect to reed would render the close of the control	AL.		
microlew Gammary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	DENNIS CORDRAY	1791			
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):				
(1) <u>DENNIS CORDRAY (PTO)</u> .	(3)				
(2) George Renzoni (Applicant's Representative).	(4)				
Date of Interview: <u>11 March 2008</u> .					
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2	²)∏ applicant's representative	e]			
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.				
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1 and 5</u> .					
Identification of prior art discussed: Herron et al(5549791),	Cook et al (5562740), Hassi e	<u>et al (5637193)</u> .			
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g)∐ was not reached. h)⊠ N	I/A.			
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed possible amendments to overcome indefiniteness and anticipatory rejections. Also discussed interpretation of product-by-process claims. Discused Hassi et al with respect to increased whiteness of fibers over time. No agreement on patentability was reached. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.					
	/Dennis Cordray/ Examiner, Art Unit 1791 Examiner's signature, if requi	red			